

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/899,817	MOCHIZUKI, YASUYUKI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Steven S. Paik	2876

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Steven S. Paik. (3) _____.

(2) Ruthleen Uy, Applicant's representative. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 04 February 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.



Steven S. Paik
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant's representative explained about how the claimed invention operates. Furthermore, one of the claimed features in claim 1, a database, was discussed and compared with a collating means in the cited reference (Yamamoto (US 5,936,709)). The examiner agreed the collating means provides different function than the claimed feature. Upon receiving and entering the amendment after final, a decision to further prosecute the application will be made and communicated to the Applicant in a timely manner.